

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/790,124	03/02/2004	Yoshitaka Miyake	Q80136	1136
23373	7590 11/10/2005		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			LIPMAN, BERNARD	
SUITE 800	YLVANIA AVENUE, N.W	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20037		1713	

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				4
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	- 3
	055	10/790,124	MIYAKE, YOSHITAKA	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
		Bernard Lipman	1713	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Diperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed  n the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 Sec</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pr		
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) <u>5-7</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>6</u> is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>5 and 7</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers			
_	•			
· · · · ·	The specification is objected to by the Examiner		Francisco	
اسارات	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceeding a splicant may not request that any objection to the company in the company is/are: a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	- · ·		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receiv (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	y (PTO-413) Pate Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/790,124 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 5 and 7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,464.

  Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the additional limitation in the present claim of the required Tg would be an obvious characteristic to optimize in the same exact polymers for the same exact purpose. The rejection, therefore, is maintained absent evidence of unexpected characteristics relative to the Tg limitation. Applicant's arguments with regard to the rejection of claim 6 have been considered and have been found persuasive.
- 3. Claim 6 is allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/790,124 Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bernard Lipman whose telephone number is 571-272-1105. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on 571-272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bernard Lipman
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1713

BL/hs